

OCT 12 1999

1464

Mike Smith
1970 Wild Oak Lane
Chico CA 95928-4000
phone: 530-343-5411

e-mail: mike@lightfootmedia.com

September 22, 1999

Mr. Lester Snow - Executive Director
CalFed Bay-Delta Program
1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1155
Sacramento CA 96814

Subject: Comments on Revised Draft EIS/EIR for the Preferred Program Plan

Dear Mr. Snow:

I appreciate the opportunity to make comments. I regret that I have not read the whole document, but have read summaries, and will therefore need to comment based on my understandings.

Delay in adding on- or off-stream storage

I understand that the plan calls for delaying the decision on whether to add storage for 7 years into the implementation schedule. I agree with such a delay.

The results of conservation and upstream watershed restoration need to be known, at least preliminarily; I am particularly hopeful of the watershed restoration as a method to reestablish a natural storage. Additionally, it would be fruitful to have some higher level of certainty regarding demand before we begin to consider dams.

In my opinion, it is dams and channelized streambeds that have caused so much of the damage we are now trying to correct, so it would appear prudent to be certain they are part of the solution before building more.

I think some of the interest in dams here in the north State is being promoted by those who want to transfer water. They sense that additional storage will allow them to transfer more. Of course, they want the taxpayers to build the dams.

Ground water protection

As you are aware, we are highly dependent on ground water here, both for agriculture and for domestic consumption.

Mr. Lester Snow
CalFed Bay-Delta Program
September 22, 1999
Page Two

I ask that there be iron clad guarantees that the quality and quantity of the ground water will be protected as part of any transfer authority.

Specifically, the power to authorize a transfer should not be left unfettered to local commissions or boards. These local boards will likely become populated with folks who would benefit from water sales; they should not have the power to reduce the ground water quality or lower the water table.

Costs should be borne by users

Particularly, southern California beneficiaries should be funding any construction or program that provides water to them or that restores stream health that was deteriorated by fulfilling their needs.

Southern California politicians say they need more water for future demand; perhaps they should control their growth so they will not have so many people; that appears to be a better solution than redirecting their problem to northern California.

Thanks for listening; look forward to the final draft in April.

Best regards,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Mike Smith".

Mike Smith